REMARKS

The Office Action mailed April 15, 2011 has been reviewed and carefully considered. No new matter has been added. Claims 1–37 are pending. Reconsideration of the rejections in light of the present arguments is respectfully requested.

Before addressing the substance of the present rejections, Applicants must strenuously object to the Examiner's issuance of parallel rejections based on the Kondo reference and the Wiegand reference respectively. The Examiner states, "Examiner provides additional prior art rejections which further demonstrate that all of the presently pending claims are either anticipated by the prior art or obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention over the prior art."

The Examiner is reminded that MPEP § 706.02(I) states rejections should be "confined strictly to the best available art," and that "[m]erely cumulative rejections … should be avoided." Wiegand and Kondo are cumulative with respect to one another, and *both* references fail to teach the present invention. By introducing a second set of rejections, the Examiner has unfairly increased the burden on Applicants in responding to the Office Action without advancing prosecution. Applicants address both sets of rejections in full below, but it is respectfully requested that the Examiner confine any future Office Actions to only the best available art.

Claims 1–36 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. In particular, the Examiner notes that the present claims recite language that allows the use of "at least one of" four different macroblock mode selection steps.

The Examiner asserts that there is no explanation in the present specification for how one might perform the different mode selection techniques in tandem. Although the Examiner explicitly acknowledges that the present specification describes using the four approaches jointly (*see* p. 9, lns 26–27), the Examiner asserts that those of ordinary skill in the art would not be able to implement such joint selection.

The Examiner goes on to ask a series of questions pertaining to the supposed lack of enablement. However, the answers to each of these questions could readily be supplied by those having ordinary skill in the art. The Examiner's first question, regarding the criteria one would use to determine which of the four steps to apply, in fact encompasses *all* of the questions posed. Those

having ordinary skill in the art could devise any appropriate set of criteria to accomplish this, or could simply determine in advance which steps are to be applied. Devising such criteria is within the level of skill present in the art at the time of filing and need not be spelled out in the written description.

Going to the claim language itself, each of the steps recites, "selecting the mode for the current macroblock in response to..." This language does not dictate that any one step strictly defines the macroblock mode, but merely that the recited selection is responsive to the information found in performing the step. Thus a determination could clearly be made "in response to" multiple sources of information.

One exemplary combination is to combine the checking for a subset of macroblock modes with the early stopping technique. Per the description in the present specification, the early-stoping threshold can clearly be applied to any situation where multiple modes are checked. If, in checking the subset, one mode reaches the early-stopping threshold, then the rest of the subset would not need to be checked. This combination is clearly enabled in the present specification, which states, "Instead of exhaustively checking all possible modes, in our preferred embodiments of the present invention, we use early stopping criteria to reach fast mode decision. ... If one threshold for one particular mode is met, we stop checking other left modes." Present specification, p. 11, lns 27–31. This, combined with the *explicit* statement that the categories may be combined (p. 9, lns 26–27), enables the present claim language.

The same reasoning applies to all of the independent claims as well as their dependent claims. For at least the above reasons, it is respectfully asserted that those having ordinary skill in the art would be enabled by the present specification to implement claims 1–36. Reconsideration of the rejection is earnestly solicited.

Claims 1–36 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to point out and distinctly claim the subject matter of the invention. In particular, referring to the first paragraph rejection described above, the Examiner asserts that the four recited selection features would conflict with each other if performed jointly.

However, as described in detail above, one can easily combine the early stopping threshold with at least the technique of "checking first modes for a subset of macroblock modes." As such, it

is the present claim language allowing "at least one of" the recited options is clear and non-contradictory. It is therefore respectfully asserted that those having ordinary skill in the art would understand the present claim language and would find the language clear as to the intended scope. Reconsideration of the rejection is earnestly solicited.

Claims 1–2, 4–6, 9–14, 16–18, 21–26, 28–30, and 33–37 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Publication No. 2004/0218674 to Kondo et al. (hereinafter "Kondo"). Claims 3, 15, and 27 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kondo in view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003/0099292 to Wang et al. (hereinafter "Wang"). Claims 7–8, 19–20, and 31–32 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kondo in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,926,573 to Kim et al. (hereinafter "Kim").

Before addressing the particular features of the present claim language, it is believed that a review of the present invention in the context of the cited art is in order. Based on the thrust of the Examiner's latest arguments, Applicants believe that their arguments have been misunderstood.

The "Background" section of the present specification states, "[M]ode decisions for interframes pose a large burden for the encoder. Accordingly what is needed is a new scheme to reduce encoding decision complexity while maintaining coding efficiency." Page 1, lns 19–22. The specification goes on to list the possible modes that a macroblock may take, and states, "All of these choices have made mode decisions very complicated. Embodiments of the present invention simplify mode decisions by reducing the number of potential candidate modes that need to be examined."

The techniques of the present claims recite features that are directed to that end. Each of the recited techniques differs from prior art implementations at least because they each present a way to cut down on the number of modes that they need to consider. While the Examiner is correct in asserting that basic mode selection has been around in many forms and for many years, embodiments of the present invention provide *shortcuts* that are not present in any of the cited references.

To begin with, claim 1 recites, *inter alia*, "checking first modes for a subset of macroblock modes, selectively checking other modes in response to motion vector information of the checked first modes, and selecting the mode for the current macroblock in response to the checked modes."

Claims 13 and 25 recite analogous language. The Examiner cites paragraphs 46–49 of Kondo as reading on this feature, but it is respectfully noted that the Examiner has mischaracterized the reference.

In particular, the Examiner points to the coding of a B-frame using two out of five reference pictures as checking a "subset of modes." In doing so, the Examiner assumes that "one of the inter-coding modes is selected for the macroblock." The Examiner's assumption does not seem warranted, nor even applicable to the coding of an entire frame. In particular, a frame is composed of *many* macroblocks and, while each macroblock has its own coding mode, merely pointing to a frame does not describe checking a subset of the possible modes.

Instead, Kondo's paragraph 49 contains the entirety of its mode selection discussion. However, Kondo treats the mode selecting unit 109 as a "black box" and does not provide *any* description for *how* it goes about selecting a mode. There is no disclosure, nor even the vaguest suggestion, that Kondo would consider anything less than the full set of modes in determining which to select for encoding a given frame.

Even assuming, *arguendo*, that Kondo's selecting unit 109 did teach checking a subset of modes, it is further clear that Kondo also fails to show selectively checking other modes in response to motion vector information of the checked first modes. Although Kondo discusses using motion vectors in its mode selection, there is no hint of such a *second stage* of mode checking at all.

To be clear, the present claim explicitly recites checking first modes for a particular subset, and then checking additional nodes based on information gleaned *from the first modes*. In other words, the motion vector information is explicitly made conditional on checking the first subset—a feature wholly absent from Kondo.

As such, it is respectfully asserted that Kondo fails to disclose or suggest checking first modes for a subset of macroblock modes, and further that Kondo fails to disclose or suggest selectively checking other modes in response to motion vector information of the checked first modes.

Claim 1 further recites, "checking the macroblock mode of at least one neighboring macroblock, and selecting the mode for the current macroblock in response to the macroblock mode

of the at least one checked neighboring macroblock." Claims 13 and 25 recite analogous language. The Examiner points to passages relating motion vector prediction as reading on mode selection.

It is respectfully pointed out to the Examiner that motion vector prediction (i.e., information that describes how a given macroblock will move between frames) and mode selection (i.e., how a given macroblock will be encoded) are two very different processes. Said plainly, the cited portions of Kondo are not used in selecting a mode. As noted above, Kondo's sole description for mode selection is in paragraph 49, and that paragraph does not provide *any* details whatsoever as to how mode selection is performed.

The Examiner even acknowledges this point, stating, "While the motion vector is not itself the macroblock mode, the method by which Kondo computes the motion vectors is determined according to the mode of the macroblock and the neighboring macroblocks." It isn't relevant how Kondo goes about computing motion vectors—the claim recites how to select *macroblock modes*. The motion vectors are not macroblock modes and, hence, a discussion of computing motion vectors has no bearing on how macroblock modes are selected.

It is therefore respectfully asserted that Kondo fails to disclose or suggest checking the macroblock mode of at least one neighboring macroblock and selecting the mode for a current macroblock in response to the macroblock mode of the checked neighboring macroblock.

Claim 1 further recites, "checking the cost of a subset of macroblock modes, further checking only intra-coded modes if the checked cost meets a preset criteria, and selecting the mode for the current macroblock in response to the checked modes." Claims 13 and 25 recite analogous language. The Examiner points to Kondo's discussion of extra processing that may be performed on intra-mode and direct mode blocks.

Despite the Examiner's assertions, there do not appear to be any references to a processing cost in paragraph 60, or anywhere else in the reference. There is no mention of a processing cost in relation to the motion vector prediction described in paragraph 60, nor of anything that could be reasonably interpreted as a cost of any kind. Although the term "cost" is to be given the broadest reasonable interpretation, there does not appear to be any basis at all for the Examiner's present interpretation.

Even assuming, *arguendo*, that Kondo disclosed finding the cost of a subset of macroblock modes, Kondo does not describe or suggest using such a cost to determine whether to check only intra-coded modes and, furthermore, certainly does not describe selecting a mode in response to those checked modes. As discussed at length above, a motion vector prediction, such as that described in paragraph 60, cannot reasonably read on selecting a mode. Furthermore, Kondo's only discussion of selecting a mode is in paragraph 49, and that paragraph provides *no details* as to how such a selection might be accomplished. There is therefore nothing in the reference that might connect the purported "processing cost" to the selection of a macroblock mode.

It is therefore respectfully asserted that Kondo fails to disclose or suggest checking the cost of a subset of macroblock modes, further checking only intra-coded modes if the checked cost meets a preset criteria, and selecting the mode for the current macroblock in response to the checked modes.

Claim 1 further recites, "adjusting an early-stopping threshold in response to checked macroblock modes, and selecting the mode for the current macroblock in response to the checked macroblock modes if the adjusted early-stopping threshold is met." Claims 13 and 25 recite analogous language. The Examiner again points to Kondo's discussion of extra processing that may be performed on intra-mode and direct mode blocks as reading on this feature.

As above, where the Examiner conjures a "cost" from nothing, the Examiner's interpretation of the text as reading on a "threshold" seems to be entirely without support in the reference. The Examiner asserts that Kondo stops checking macroblock modes if three neighboring blocks have a motion vector of zero. This is not an "early stopping" threshold by any reasonable interpretation, because Kondo still checks all three neighboring macroblocks. Kondo always checks three neighboring macroblocks, regardless of how many have motion vectors and never "stops early." *See* Kondo, ¶¶ 55 and 60. Thus there can be no "early-stopping" threshold of any sort.

And, even assuming *arguendo* that such an early-stopping threshold could be inferred, it is nevertheless clear that it would have nothing to do with macroblock *mode* selection. As described at length above, the prediction of motion vectors in Kondo is not in any way related to macroblock mode selection. Kondo describes its mode selecting unit exclusively in paragraph 49 and provides no details whatsoever as to how it actually performs its selection. There is no suggestion as to how

mode selection might be performed at all, let alone any disclosure of using an early-stopping threshold.

It is therefore respectfully asserted that Kondo fails to disclose or suggest adjusting an early-stopping threshold in response to checked macroblock modes or selecting the mode for the current macroblock in response to the checked macroblock modes if the adjusted early-stopping threshold is met.

Claim 37 recites, *inter alia*, "selecting a subset of macroblock modes for encoding; comparing said subset of macroblock modes for coding efficiency; selecting a mode having favorable coding efficiency, responsive to said step of comparing modes." The Examiner again points to Kondo's discussion of motion vector prediction.

To reiterate: predicting a motion vector is plainly distinct from selecting a macroblock mode. Furthermore, as noted above, Kondo makes no effort to select a *subset* of macroblock modes for checking. Kondo describes its mode selecting unit exclusively in paragraph 49 and provides no details whatsoever as to how it actually performs its selection. Despite providing a long list of possible modes, Kondo gives no indication that it might check fewer than all of them in selecting a mode.

In addition, there is no mention *anywhere* in the reference of comparing macroblock modes for coding efficiency. The Examiner asserts that paragraphs 60 and 63 discuss comparing the modes to code in the most efficient manner, but there is frankly no support for that assertion in the text.

It is therefore respectfully asserted that Kondo fails to disclose or suggest selecting a subset of macroblock modes for encoding or comparing said subset of macroblock modes for coding efficiency.

Regarding each of Claims 1, 13, 25, and 37, we note that Wang and Kim do not cure the deficiencies of Kondo, and are silent regarding the same. To that end, we note that Wang was only cited against Claims 3, 15, and 37, and that Kim was only cited against claims 7–8, 19–20, and 31–32.

"A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference." MPEP §2131, citing

Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987).

The failure of an asserted combination to teach or suggest each and every feature of a claim remains fatal to an obviousness rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103. Section 2143.03 of the MPEP requires the "consideration" of every claim feature in an obviousness determination. To render a claim unpatentable, however, the Office must do more than merely "consider" each and every feature for this claim. Instead, the asserted combination of the patents must also teach or suggest *each and every claim feature*. *See In re Royka*, 490 F.2d 981, 180 USPQ 580 (CCPA 1974) (emphasis added) (to establish *prima facie* obviousness of a claimed invention, all the claim features must be taught or suggested by the prior art). Indeed, as the Board of Patent Appeal and Interferences has recently confirmed, a proper obviousness determination requires that an Examiner make "a searching comparison of the claimed invention - *including all its limitations* - with the teaching of the prior art." *See In re Wada and Murphy*, Appeal 2007-3733, *citing In re Ochiai*, 71 F.3d 1565, 1572 (Fed. Cir. 1995) (emphasis in original). "If an independent claim is nonobvious under 35 U.S.C. 103, then any claim depending therefrom is nonobvious" (MPEP §2143.03, citing *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988)).

Accordingly, Claims 1, 13, 25, and 37 are patentably distinct and non-obvious over the cited references for at least the reasons set forth above.

Claims 2-12 directly or indirectly depend from Claim 1 and, thus, includes all the elements of Claim 1. Claims 14-24 directly or indirectly depend from Claim 13 and, thus, includes all the elements of Claim 13. Claims 26-36 directly or indirectly depend from Claim 25 and, thus, includes all the elements of Claim 10. Accordingly, Claims 2-12 are patentably distinct and non-obvious over the cited references for at least the reasons set forth above with respect to Claim 1, Claims 14-24 are patentably distinct and non-obvious over the cited references for at least the reasons set forth above with respect to Claim 13, and Claims 26-36 are patentably distinct and non-obvious over the cited references for at least the reasons set forth above with respect to Claim 25.

Thus, reconsideration of the rejections is respectfully requested.

Claims 1–2, 4–6, 9–14, 16–18, 21–26, 28–30, and 33–37 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Rate Distortion Optimized Mode Selection for Very Low Bit Rate

Video Coding and the Emerging H.263 Standard, by Wiegand et al. (hereinafter "Wiegand"). Claims 3, 15, and 27 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wiegand in view of Wang. Claims 7–8, 19–20, and 31–32 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wiegand in view of Kim.

As noted above, these rejections are wholly cumulative with the rejections based on Kondo. As such, even if the Examiner should disagree with the arguments set forth herein, one of the two sets of rejections should be withdrawn pursuant to MPEP § 706.02.

The general discussion set forth above with respect to the present invention and Kondo applies just as strongly to Wiegand. The present claims recite features directed to reducing the number of potential candidate modes that need to be examined. Each of the recited techniques differs from prior art implementations at least because they each present a way to cut down on the number of modes that they need to consider. While the Examiner is correct in asserting that basic mode selection has been around in many forms and for many years, embodiments of the present invention provide *shortcuts* that are not present in any of the cited references.

Claim 1 recites, *inter alia*, "checking first modes for a subset of macroblock modes, selectively checking other modes in response to motion vector information of the checked first modes, and selecting the mode for the current macroblock in response to the checked modes." Claims 13 and 25 recite analogous language. The Examiner asserts that Wiegand's discussion of using a trellis to find the best combination of modes reads on this feature.

However, the description of the trellis flatly contradicts the Examiner's assertion. In particular, Wiegand states, "In this case, the nodes in the trellis for $i = 1, \cdots, N$ are given by the elements in $\mathbf{I}$ ..." Wiegand, p. 184. As stated on page 183, "For a multimode video coder, each macroblock in X can be coded using only one of K possible modes given by the set $\mathbf{I} = \{I_1, \ldots, I_K\}$." This is depicted in FIGs. 1(a) and 1(b) which use all four possible modes of an exemplary set $\mathbf{I}$. Clearly then, Wiegand explicitly does *not* check a *subset* of macroblock modes and instead checks *all* of the modes at once.

It is therefore respectfully asserted that Wiegand fails to disclose or suggest checking first modes for a subset of macroblock modes. Logically then, Wiegand also fails to disclose or suggest

selectively checking other modes in response to motion vector information of the checked first modes and selecting the mode for the current macroblock in response to the checked modes.

Claim 1 further recites, "checking the macroblock mode of at least one neighboring macroblock, and selecting the mode for the current macroblock in response to the macroblock mode of the at least one checked neighboring macroblock." Claims 13 and 25 recite analogous language. The Examiner asserts without specific support that Wiegand selects macroblocks based on the modes of adjacent macroblocks.

The Examiner's assertion appears to be without support in the reference. Wiegand determines all of the macroblock modes at once by solving an optimization problem. *See* Wiegand, eq. (1). As such, Wiegand *cannot* at any point "check" the macroblock of a neighboring macroblock because the macroblock modes are all determined at the same time—there would be no neighbor modes to check. Logically therefore Wiegand cannot select a mode for a macroblock based on such checking.

It is therefore respectfully asserted that Wiegand fails to disclose or suggest checking the macroblock mode of at least one neighboring macroblock and further fails to disclose or suggest selecting the mode for the current macroblock in response to the macroblock mode of the at least one checked neighboring macroblock.

Claim 1 further recites, "checking the cost of a subset of macroblock modes, further checking only intra-coded modes if the checked cost meets a preset criteria, and selecting the mode for the current macroblock in response to the checked modes." Claims 13 and 25 recite analogous language. The Examiner asserts that Wiegand teaches this feature in its discussion of minimizing a Lagrangian cost function.

As noted above, however, Wiegand explicitly checks *all* of the macroblock modes simultaneously in its optimization. *See* FIGs. 1(a) and 1(b). Thus Wiegand explicitly does *not* check the cost of a *subset* of the macroblock modes. Even assuming, *arguendo*, that Wiegand could be interpreted as doing so, the present claim recites performing additional steps conditioned upon the initially checked costs meeting a preset criteria. There is nothing in Wiegand which even faintly resembles such criteria. Then, even assuming *arguendo* that Wiegand did discuss such criteria, there

is nothing in the reference to suggest that Wiegand checks only intra-coded modes as a result of meeting such criteria.

Although the word "cost" does appear in the reference, it is clear that the technology described in Wiegand has no relation whatsoever to the present claims. As such, it is respectfully asserted that Wiegand fails to disclose or suggest checking the cost of a subset of macroblock modes, further checking only intra-coded modes if the checked cost meets a preset criteria, and selecting the mode for the current macroblock in response to the checked modes.

Claim 1 further recites, "adjusting an early-stopping threshold in response to checked macroblock modes, and selecting the mode for the current macroblock in response to the checked macroblock modes if the adjusted early-stopping threshold is met." Claims 13 and 25 recite analogous language. The Examiner asserts that Wiegand's discussion of Lagrangian multipliers reads on this feature.

However, as pointed out above, Wiegand checks all of its possible macroblocks in performing its optimization. There is never any condition in Wiegand where fewer than all are considered, because Wiegand is trying to find the *best* choice, rather than looking for a way to speed the decision process. Clearly then there can be no early-stopping threshold.

The Examiner's suggestion of the Langrangian multiplier widely misses the mark. As Wiegand points out, the Langrangian multiplier is merely a parameter that is tuned to produce a desired coding rate. *See* Wiegand, p. 184, part B. This has no effect on which modes are checked because, as has been stated at length above, Wiegand checks *all* modes.

It is therefore respectfully asserted that Wiegand fails to disclose or suggest adjusting an early-stopping threshold in response to checked macroblock modes and selecting the mode for the current macroblock in response to the checked macroblock modes if the adjusted early-stopping threshold is met.

Claim 37 recites, *inter alia*, "selecting a subset of macroblock modes for encoding; comparing said subset of macroblock modes for coding efficiency" The Examiner asserts that "macroblock modes which do not follow along the optimal path are considered to be less efficient."

However, as has been discussed at length above, Wiegand does not at any point select a *subset* of modes for encoding. Instead, Wiegand checks *all* of its modes. Again, this is due to the fact that Wiegand is looking for *optimal* modes rather than trying to make the decision process itself faster.

It is therefore respectfully asserted that Wiegand fails to disclose or suggest selecting a subset of macroblock modes for encoding and comparing said subset of macroblock modes for coding efficiency.

Regarding each of Claims 1, 13, 25, and 37, we note that Wang and Kim do not cure the deficiencies of Wiegand, and are silent regarding the same. To that end, we note that Wang was only cited against Claims 3, 15, and 37, and that Kim was only cited against claims 7–8, 19–20, and 31–32.

"A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference." MPEP §2131, citing *Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987).

The failure of an asserted combination to teach or suggest each and every feature of a claim remains fatal to an obviousness rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103. Section 2143.03 of the MPEP requires the "consideration" of every claim feature in an obviousness determination. To render a claim unpatentable, however, the Office must do more than merely "consider" each and every feature for this claim. Instead, the asserted combination of the patents must also teach or suggest *each and every claim feature*. *See In re Royka*, 490 F.2d 981, 180 USPQ 580 (CCPA 1974) (emphasis added) (to establish *prima facie* obviousness of a claimed invention, all the claim features must be taught or suggested by the prior art). Indeed, as the Board of Patent Appeal and Interferences has recently confirmed, a proper obviousness determination requires that an Examiner make "a searching comparison of the claimed invention - *including all its limitations* - with the teaching of the prior art." *See In re Wada and Murphy*, Appeal 2007-3733, *citing In re Ochiai*, 71 F.3d 1565, 1572 (Fed. Cir. 1995) (emphasis in original). "If an independent claim is nonobvious under 35 U.S.C. 103, then any claim depending therefrom is nonobvious" (MPEP §2143.03, citing *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988)).

Accordingly, Claims 1, 13, 25, and 37 are patentably distinct and non-obvious over the cited references for at least the reasons set forth above.

Claims 2-12 directly or indirectly depend from Claim 1 and, thus, includes all the elements of Claim 1. Claims 14-24 directly or indirectly depend from Claim 13 and, thus, includes all the elements of Claim 13. Claims 26-36 directly or indirectly depend from Claim 25 and, thus, includes all the elements of Claim 10. Accordingly, Claims 2-12 are patentably distinct and non-obvious over the cited references for at least the reasons set forth above with respect to Claim 1, Claims 14-24 are patentably distinct and non-obvious over the cited references for at least the reasons set forth above with respect to Claim 13, and Claims 26-36 are patentably distinct and non-obvious over the cited references for at least the reasons set forth above with respect to Claim 25.

In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of the claims set forth in the Office Action of April 15, 2011 be withdrawn, that pending claims 1-37 be allowed, and that the case proceed to early issuance of Letters Patent in due course.

No fee is believed due with regard to the filing of this amendment itself, however a one month extension of time for response is hereby requested and therefore please charge the required fee of one hundred and thirty dollars ($130.00) for extending the time for a response within the first month after the original response date, pursuant to 37 CFR 1.17(a)(1). No additional fee is believed due. However, if an additional fee is due, please charge the fee to to Deposit Account 07-0832.

Respectfully submitted,

Peng Yin

By: **/Guy H. Eriksen/**
Guy Eriksen
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No.: 41,736

Patent Operations
Thomson Licensing LLC
P.O. Box 5312
Princeton, NJ 08543-5312

August 12, 2011